

against some Church which existed before it.

Besides, the title Catholic is admittedly descriptive of an essential quality of the Church of Christ, and so it is given in the Apostles Creed as the distinctive quality of the true Church of Christ, by means of which it is distinguished from all false pretenders.

But there is on the other hand an objection raised which those who use it think outweighs all the arguments in favor of a change. They say that the religious movement of the sixteenth century was essentially a protesting movement, and that this should be indicated by its name Protestant, and they maintain that the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal Churches are essentially part of that movement.

For ourselves we deny that the term Catholic can be applied to any but the one Church which has taught all nations, and which has subsisted all days from the time of its institution by Christ, teaching all things which Christ Himself taught to His Apostles, this being the commission which Christ gave to His Apostles.

The Protestant Episcopal Church, which has not yet existed for four centuries, cannot with any propriety be designated Catholic; first, because its Articles of Religion are purely of human invention, settled by act of a Parliament which had no authority from Christ to define what the Christian faith is. Neither of these Churches, nor both together, can be the one Church which Christ commanded His Apostles to preach to all nations, teaching all whatsoever He revealed, and with which He promised to abide even to the consummation of the world.

Neither can the Episcopal Church be properly designated "American," for it is not America either in origin or in having attained any special prominence in America.

In the number of its communicants it stands only in the ninth place among the Churches of the United States. The Catholic Church stands first, with 6,250,000 of communicants. The Episcopal Methodists come next, with 2,250,000 and certain other sects follow with fairly large numbers, until in the ninth rank comes the Protestant Episcopal Church with only 532,054 communicants, according to the last census.

It is the height of presumption even to propose that under such circumstances it should claim to be either American or Catholic. But it is not probable that the coming convention will make such a claim.

THE RULE OF FAITH.

LECTURE DELIVERED BY REV. O. B. DEVLIN, S. J., IN THE CHURCH OF OUR LADY HELP OF CHRISTIANS ON SUNDAY, 30TH AUGUST 1903, AT WALLACEBURG, ONT.

"He that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark 16-16).

The subject for your consideration, this evening, is the reasonableness and necessity for the Rule of Faith proposed and followed by the Catholic Church. It is well worthy of your serious attention not only because it claims to be the only one instituted by Christ and counts three hundred millions of adherents; but also because the subject is one of the most important in the field of religious enquiry. The right solution of this question disposes of all doubts on the subject of Religion, brings peace to the mind and solves the vexed question for many a perplexed mind, "which is the Religion of Christ, and consequently which should be the Church for me."

In a matter of such moment how advisable to ask and implore light from the Holy Ghost that we may see and understand as God wishes, and grace for the will, that being enlightened we may conform our religious belief in keeping with the right Rule of Faith.

We shall only deal this evening with the two Rules of Faith which appeal to the great majority of men who give any attention to the subject of Religion and which are accountable for the Religious differences in the Christian world to-day. The Catholic Rule of Faith, which is the cause we advocate, holds that the Divine Commission to the Apostles was to preach the word of God "Go teach all nations, etc.," and requires me to believe that I must rely for what I have to believe and to do in order to save my soul, on the infallible teaching and authority of the Catholic Church; in other words, the teaching body of the Catholic Church, whether represented by the Pope speaking ex cathedra or again the Church and Pope united, speaking on faith and morals, or again the uniform teaching of the Church at all times represented by the episcopal body throughout the world, is infallible. The two great sources of their teaching are the Bible and Tradition or God's Written and Unwritten Word. All revealed truth must flow from one or both of these fountains.

The Catholic Church claims to be the divinely appointed custodian of these two fountains of God's word. She watches over them with equal care, and they are both equally precious to her. The only distinction acknowledged by her is that the Bible is God's written word and tradition is God's unwritten word. We are not, however, to infer that God wrote one word of the Bible. We accept it as God's word because the Church teaches that the divinely commissioned teachers of the word of God wrote it under divine inspiration just as they preached under divine inspiration.

The writing or the preaching of the Apostles on the word of God, commends itself to us with equal value. And as the Catholic Church to-day as at all times continues to teach on doctrine and morals only what the Apostles commissioned to the New Testament or preached, and has been enjoined by Christ to continue their mission, namely to preach and teach, until the end of time, she has been endowed with infallibility. This was the One and Only Rule of Faith in existence until the time of Luther. The Reformation invented another and the partisans of this movement "under the leadership and inspiration of their leader and founder, Luther, cast aside the infallible authority of any teaching body in the Church on matters doctrinal. The Bible only is the Rule of Faith. Followers of this system reject their Tradition and contend, all that we are obliged to believe may be found in the Bible only. They scout the idea of an infallible teacher or custodian of the Bible, and claim for every man the right to interpret the Bible, or Private Interpretation.

We think well to call your attention at once to the fact that St. John positively denies that all the teachings of Christ are in the Bible, for he says: "There are also many other things which Jesus did, which if they were written every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written." (St. John, Ch. 21, v. 25.)

St. John does not seem to hold that all teaching of the word of God must be consigned to writing to command belief; for he says again: "Having more things to write to you, I would not by paper and ink; for I hope that I shall be with you, and speak face to face; and that your joy may be full." (2 John 1-12). Does he not even seem by these words to state his preference for moral teaching of the word of God, and was he not inspired when he penned those lines? If the bible alone was to be the depository of God's word what did St. Paul mean when he said: "Brethren, stand firm and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by epistle." The theory of the bible only is further refuted by what he, St. Paul, says to Timothy: "The things which thou hast heard from me before many witnesses, the same command to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2, 2.) Tradition, then, like the bible, is equally the word of God. The Apostles were commissioned by Christ to teach the word of God in its entirety, and we have a right to hear it: "Go teach . . . teaching them to observe all the things that I have commanded you." They were not restricted to preach only what some of their afterwards consigned to the New Testament.

The proposition that the written word of God is to be confined to the treatment of private interpretation, and that that is the safer and surer mode of knowing and understanding God's word, is equally unfounded and does not seem borne out by the teaching of St. Peter, for he writes (2 Peter 1-2): "Understand this first that no prophecy of the Scripture is made by private interpretation." and, again, speaking of writings of St. Paul, which form part of the Bible, "In which form are some things hard to understand which the unlearned and unstable wrest as also in the other Scriptures to their own perdition." (2 Peter 3-16).

Remark that each time (that) we say St. Peter, St. John, St. Paul affirm or deny by their writings any statement, it is the same as to say the Bible affirms or denies, as the writings of those infallible Teachers form part of the Bible.

Having now exposed the two Rules of Faith and stated how they seem to us to coincide or agree with the language of the Bible, let us inquire how they correspond with the Plan of Christ's great mission on earth.

We naturally admit that Christ came into this world not only to be a Redeemer but also to be a Teacher. Not only did He die but He founded one Church to continue His mission.

We contend, that when Christ said "I will build My Church" He intended one Church for all Christians, and when He enjoined on the Apostles and their successors "Go teach . . . and teach them to observe all things I have commanded you . . . He strictly required from the Apostolic Body uniformity of preaching until the end of time. . . . There was to be only One Code of Christianity.

The penalty for non-acceptance was nothing less than "eternal perdition." "He that believeth not shall be condemned." Surely, then, we are justified in expecting that, dissention nor equivocation about our teachers, error in their teaching must be out of question and that we shall be provided with some infallible guide in knowing what we have to believe and do for salvation.

Is this not reasonable? Well Christ solemnly promised that the gates of hell would not prevail against His Church. He promised to be with that Church until the end of time. He requested until the end of time, we would hear to Him. He certainly did insist on unity and harmony as distinguishing marks in the teachers and members of His Church (John 17, 21). And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me; that they all may be one as the Father in Me and I in thee that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me."

How expressive His words "one God, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism!" How feelingly He manifests His will! There is to be but the one Church for His children, and that Church is to be recognized by the "one Shepherd" and the harmony which is to exist between the shepherd and the sheep. "And other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice." If shall be one fold and one shepherd. If the teachers are many and contradictory in their teachings, shall we accept them as the representative of Christ? Shall their discordant voices be the voice of Christ and Who amongst them will be the one Shepherd?

In reviewing the different religions throughout the world to-day how can we fail to recognize in the Catholic Church alone the plan of Christ's Church? Her empire extends from the rising to the setting of the sun; but whilst her subjects live under different flags, speak different languages, everywhere, it is the one and same Church, the one and same supreme Authority in spiritual matters, the self-same teaching.

In all other religions, even the superficial observer cannot fail to observe and admit variety of creeds, variety of teachers, and a never ending variety of religions coming into existence. What causes can be assigned for the unity on the one side and the diversity and division on the other?

We unhesitatingly answer, the respective rules of faith are the great factors. We fear not to charge the system which rejects the infallible teacher and allows private interpretation as the cause of the divisions which exist in religious bodies of to-day. It is the parent of indifference and rejection of all Christianity.

We shall now inquire when and how Christ, the Divine Founder, instituted the rule of faith, and how the Apostles understood Him. It was on a very solemn occasion shortly after His resurrection and before His ascent into Heaven that He addressed the assembled Apostles, as we can read in St. Matthew Ch. 28, verses 19, 20: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you (necessarily your successors) all days, even to the consummation of the world."

Again, says the same Evangelist: "And if he will not hear the Church let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." (Mt. 18-17).

St. Mark, ch. 16-15, says: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature." St. Luke is not less explicit: "He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me." (Luke 10-16).

And what does St. John say: "These things have I spoken to you remaining with you. But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you." (John 14-25, 26).

Well, my dear brethren, there are four important witnesses, and can you have any doubt as to whether they testify in favor of the Catholic rule of faith or not? Can you infer from their testimony that Christ required His teaching to be committed to writing, and exacted as essential to writing, into His religion, that Christians should be provided with a bible—should read out and subject all preaching of the Apostles and their successors to the criterion of the written word only? Would they be justified in requiring the written documents of Christ's teaching, before accepting and hearing the preaching of Apostles? The first Pentecost soon came, which is the first recorded date we have of the ministry of Apostles and institution of the Church. It is worthy of remark that when the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles on this day, He came not in the form of Pans of fire, wherewith to write the gospel, but of Tongues of fire wherewith to preach it.

Well, how did the Apostles, now enlightened by the Holy Ghost and animated with zeal to establish Christ's Church on earth, understand their commission?

Is there any question of writing bibles or distributing them? No, but at once they start to preach the word of God.

The Acts of the Apostles (ch. 2, v. 4) inform us that they began to speak with divers tongues (not write).

(V. 6.) And the multitude was confounded in mind because that every one heard them speaking in his own tongue. And when St. Peter had preached, they enquired: "What shall we do, men, Brethren?" (verse 37).

Did St. Peter or any of the Apostles then say "before I can receive you into the Church, I must first require of you to read the Scriptures or procure a copy of them?" No, but they that received his word were at once baptized, and the number was three thousand. The first great conversion to the Church of Christ was effected by the Preaching of the word of God. And the second great conversion of five thousand men was brought about by preaching, as we read in the acts, ch. 3, v. 4. And passing from individuals to nations, may we not at once say every nation in the world was converted by preaching? Did St. Augustine introduce Christianity into England in any other way? Did St. Patrick appear at Tara with a cartload of Bibles or did he preach?

And how did the faith of which we are so proud take possession so rapidly of the entire Island of saints, and take such deep root that neither persecution nor the sword has been able to wrest this precious legacy? Was it not by the preaching of St. Patrick and his successors? What captivated the child that soon Ireland was dotted over with monasteries and became like a paradise of saints? Was it not by hearing the word of God?

And were not the converts of the Apostles and of St. Augustine and of St. Patrick and of St. Francis Xavier, who also converted thousands in a day by his preaching, good, solid Christians? Although the great majority had probably never seen or read a line of the bible?

Returning to the time of the Apostles, we would wish to ask how St. Paul was converted as also the Ethiopian both recorded in the acts. St. Paul, even, was not told to go and read, but "Arise, and go into the city; and there it shall be told thee what thou must do." (Acts 9-7).

Saint Philip found the Ethiopian in his chariot and reading the Old Testament from the Prophet Isaiah and he said to him "Thinkest thou, that thou understandest what thou readest? And he said: How can I, unless someone show me?" (Acts 8, 30, 31). Philip then instructed him and he was baptized.

It is questionable if the Apostles themselves had certainly read the Bible. Possibly, St. John only could have a complete Bible, as he wrote last and was not in easy communication with the other Apostles. Not all of the Apostles wrote, and there is nothing in their mode of proceeding to establish the Church, any more than in the wording of the Divine Commission to justify us in holding that the Bible was the Rule of Faith.

Why not even to-day, in this twentieth century, is the Bible practically followed as a Rule of Faith by the most ardent champions of the system? What are the ministers relying on to increase the numbers of their congregation? Do they hold their congregation together by reading or preaching? Are they reminding their congregation Sunday after Sunday that their Rule of Faith does not prescribe Sunday service or Sunday school—because it is not enjoined by the Bible that their preaching is infallible—that the opinions of any and of every member of the congregation is of equal value with their exposition of the word of God, that they must, in a word, ever remember the cardinal principle of Private Interpretation as the great Principle of the Reformation. Would they be gratified if a large number of the congregation protested that Church attendance was not at all required by their Rule of Faith—that it would be more logical to reject teachers of the Bible—that their views were no better than those of any ordinary member of the congregation; that, in fact, Sunday observance was unscriptural.

My Dear Brethren, practically in all such denominations the Catholic Rule of Faith is followed by preaching the Word of God, and whilst there is no infallible tribunal, ministers certainly do not strenuously object if every single member of their congregation accept their interpretation, and in every passage of Scripture—and in every matters pertaining to Doctrine and Church accept their leadership. I have no doubt also that they will contend if differences exist between the Catholic Bible and theirs, they will authoritatively decide that they have the correct version of the Bible.

Enquire if it is immaterial to the ministers and members of congregation whether Catholic Bible or not is used in their Churches.

We shall now state some amongst many other objections which we could bring forward against accepting the Bible alone as the Rule of Faith: Because it is manifestly contrary to the design which Christ proposed in instituting the Church.

He appointed the Church to preach and endowed it with infallibility, so that we might be at all time certain of the word of God.

There was no instruction given by Christ to commit His word to the Bible. The Church had existed nearly seven years before a line of the New Testament was written. The Bible was never declared by the Apostles any more than by Christ as essential to the existence of the Church. We can only be sure that we have a true Bible, when the Church has pronounced our particular Bible inspired and authentic. And all the Bibles in the world might be destroyed and still the Church would continue equal to teach the word of God.

There is little if any of the New Testament which was addressed to the world at large by the writers. At times certain portions of it were addressed to cities and even many portions to individuals. It certainly cannot be intended that it was in the mind of the Apostles to substitute this method of making known to the world, the word of God for preaching.

Only a few Apostles wrote at all; but all certainly preached the word of God and made good Christians without the aid of Bibles and without distributing copies thereof.

During the seven years which elapsed before St. Matthew had completed his share of the work, how many Christians had suffered and died for the Faith? St. Stephen amongst others. They could not, therefore, have seen the true Testament and in the fullest sense of the word, St. Mark wrote ten years after Christ; St. Luke about twenty-five, and St. John about sixty-three; in fact he finished the Book of Revelation some sixty-five years afterwards.

We are not to suppose, however, that even then the work was finished. Three hundred years elapsed before the Church authoritatively decided what the New Testament was. It was only after three hundred years that the Church pronounced the Bible in its present form.

She had to decide in the compilation of the book called the New Testament what had to be rejected as spurious and what must be accepted as the word of God; for there were many writings purporting to have dated from Apostolic times and claiming a place in the Sacred Book which she had to reject as spurious—declare without foundation.

During all this time the Church pursued her mission, teaching the word of God and disseminating her doctrines throughout the world, relying always on the promise of Christ that the gates of hell, namely, error, would never prevail against her; ever remembering that Christ promised to be with His Church until the end of time—ever commanding belief in her teaching, reminding all of the words of Christ: "He that heareth you, heareth Me."

The Bible after three hundred years existed in its present form, but not for fifteen hundred years was it possible for any one to think of calling on the faithful to procure bibles.

The art of printing was only discovered about the year 1440. Up to that time the transcription of any single copy was almost the work of a lifetime—twenty years at least. Bibles until then had to be written on parchment or sheepskin. Nothing short of \$5,000, some say \$8,000, could procure a single copy. Will any one admit that during fifteen hundred years Christ intended any such initiation fee from all before becoming a Christian or making it possible to save one's soul? Who will contend that during all this time the world was groping in darkness on the subject of religion? Was salvation during all this time only within the grasp of the rich? We have reason to say that if Luther had been born only one hundred years earlier he would have had to adopt some other policy to introduce his "reformation."

Suppose now, printing has made it possible to circulate Bibles, has salvation been made easier for the uneducated? How many to-day who cannot read? How many who cannot understand what they read? Which Bible shall we give to all, Protestant or Catholic? If Protestant, which edition—for so many have been revised, admitting errors in preceding versions. How many can verify whether they have true copies of the original? Did they ever see an original or understand the languages in which they were written, Hebrew and Greek?

Must they be satisfied with the assurance of the book agent or book seller? Oftentimes not only one word but the proper punctuation may change the entire sense.

Is our reader a scholar and has he much free time at his disposal? Poor miner! you who have spent an entire day or night toiling at the sweat of your brow, let me tell you, a much indeed is required to enable you to save your soul. I fear you will not find the elucidation of many important points a pleasant diversion. St. Augustine, who gave a lifetime to the study of Holy Writ, tells us: "There are many more passages I do not understand than what I do," and he was one of the greatest minds in his day; and St. Peter, referring to the writings of St. Paul, says: "in which are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest as also the other Scriptures, to their own perdition." (2 Peter 3, 16).

Luther, who grants liberty to all to fathom the sense of Scripture, says all the same: "It is impossible to fathom the Scriptures; we can only skip over their surface; to understand their sense would be a wonder." (Audin's Life of Luther.) Just please tell me, if you reject an authority like the Church, where in the book itself will you find proofs of its authenticity and inspiration? Of what value the book without certainty on these two points? Is it otherwise the Bible?

If you claim, according to your rule, the right of private interpretation, will you contend that you have the word of God whether you have understood the true sense or not?

Has your neighbor, who interprets differently from you, may, the very reverse, the right to hold he has the word of God? These hundred million Catholics reading the Bible accept the words "This is My Body," in their literal meaning. You say any such pretension is a blasphemous fable. Have you and we the word of God? Who will be the judge? How can we presume to interpret when St. Peter says "No prophecy of the Scripture is made by private interpretation." (2 Peter 1-20.) What exceptions does he allow to this rule?

Tell us what the cause of Christianity is gained by this latitude granted in interpreting the Word of God? Let us suppose, you have induced a foreigner or stranger to Christianity to accept your Rule of Faith. There only remains for him to choose a Church.

The city in which you live may permit you to point out hundreds of stately churches professing different creeds, but all recognized as adopting the great principles of the Reformation. Say to him, if you choose: "My friend, I have in this great Christian land, some three hundred registered denominations. They represent the wealth and style and intellect of our metropolis; you are brought into contact with the better classes; but you do not mention whether Christ, who loved the poor, ever said whether material prosperity or worldly refinement would be characteristic of the members of His Church." "The number of churches is due to the large population. There is no difference in creed between Church and Church?" "Oh, I must tell you, they are decidedly different Churches. Every Church represents a different creed." "But do they not all adopt the same standard, the Bible?" "Most assuredly, the Bible, the Bible only and nothing but the Bible! And yet you tell me they arrive at different conclusions."

"True, but they are only so many roads leading to heaven, as Talnage puts it. They are like so many railroads running from New York City to Chicago?" "Does this hold true likewise for cross roads—and if the doctrines or teachings of these Churches cross, or are contradictory, you mean to assure me that I may hold them all alike as the Word of God?" "Well, they all profess to go by the Bible—and the Bible is the sure and only road to Heaven."

Then it matters but little which I choose. One is as good as another, but I must be baptized in any case. This is accepted by all as essential for reception into any denomination. Is it not so?" "I should be glad to assure you that it was as I understand it by my Bible; but on this point many of our churches differ. Many, like Romanists, hold baptism absolutely necessary for salvation; but many also reject it. Some content as a mere ceremony of initiation. Some, again, contend that baptism by immersion alone is valid; some admit sprinkling sufficient. Some insist on infant baptism, whilst again others reject it."

The interview brings home to our enquirer the startling information that there is scarcely any one subject of religion on which contradictory views are not held—even the Divinity of Christ Himself—some holding that

Christ was God, whilst others claim He was but a man.

No one Church satisfies him on all points. He finds himself agreeing with Anglicans on one point, differing on another; in the same way with Presbyterians, Methodists and a host of others. No wonder he asks for some further time to look for some other Church which may nearer approach his conceptions of Christ's Church, or he will have to start a new Church embodying his conceptions of the word of God.

Private interpretation of the Bible has always and will always lead to divergence. It is not admitted even in the interpretation of our civil laws. When the Constitution of a country is framed, no matter how clearly it may be expressed, the Legislator provides a duly appointed tribunal for its interpretation.

What would become of the administration of justice in any country if there was no tribunal to adjudicate on conflicting claims?

And shall we admit that Christ in establishing his Church failed to provide a sure tribunal and was wanting in the foresight which would not be admitted in any ordinary legislator?

Just as we object to every man indiscriminately constituting himself, a preacher and teacher of the word of God, and insist that he should be duly called and authorized and preach only the doctrines received by the Church throughout the world, in the same way every man cannot presume to interpret the word of God and give the sense of a passage not accepted by the Church.

In refusing the system that the Bible only is the Rule of Faith we hope none will think that we wish to depreciate the value of the Bible.

Who loves the Bible and treasures it more than the Catholic Church? Who has watched over it and defended it against every heresiarach?

Who has preserved it during many long centuries? Is it for the Church God's Written Word. It is the Church which alone can maintain its dignity by declaring the book is authentic and inspired.

Not every book styled the Bible is the Bible; but only the book so styled by the infallible custodian.

St. Augustine says: "I should not have believed the gospel if the authority of the Catholic Church had not led me to love me" (Opus tome 6, p. 46 ed par. 1614).

What would have been the fate of the Bible without the Church as champion when the Arians, Manicheans, Macedonians, Belgians, Semi Pelagians successively strove to tear every vestige of Christianity into shreds, and by no other process than private interpretation: What was the power that exterminated these heresies?

The infallible tribunal of the Catholic Church. It is calamity to accuse the Church of being an enemy of the Bible or fearing to give it to the people. The reading of holy Scripture has been recommended by Pope after Pope. They have been translated into every language. The saints read the Bible on their knees, and the faithful in Church rise when the Bible is read during the most solemn service of the Church—the Mass. The priest and people sign their forehead, mouth and heart when about to hear the Bible. The priest kisses the book after reading it. It is even incensed at the Gospel—a tribute and recognition to the divine character of the book.

In the Vatican Council it was in the hall of deliberation, the Mace of State, the reminder to the assembled Bishops of the world of God's word.

In what eloquent terms has not Leo XIII. spoken of the study and reading of the holy Scriptures.

What is every sermon in the Catholic Church but a development of some passage of the Bible?

What is the catechism taught to children and the teachings of Scripture in form adapted to minds of children? Is not every exercise of our holy religion in one way or another impregnated and saturated with passages from the Bible?

Are we not at all times ready to give scriptural authority for all the most sacred ceremonies of our holy religion and for the truths we accept? Catholic with the calumny, then, that the Catholic knows not and loves not his Bible! Hear the eloquent and touching words of Cardinal Wiseman on this subject: "The Catholic Church not love and esteem the word of God! Is there any other Church which places heavier stake on the authority of the Scriptures than the Catholic?"

Whatever authority she claims over men she claims on the authority of holy Scriptures. Who hath done more for the Bible than the Church? She caught up its different fragments and portions as they proceeded from the inspired writers and united them together. Did she not keep men by hundreds and thousands employed in nothing else than in translating the holy word of God; ay, in letters of gold and upon parchment of purple to show her respect and veneration for it. Has she not commanded it to be studied in every religious house, in every university, in every ecclesiastical college and expounded to the faithful in every place and at all times? The vindication of the Catholic rule of faith, far from depreciating the dignity of the Bible and its place in Christ's Church, will ever be its mainstay.

We have made an honest criticism, we hope without giving offence, of a new rule which came into existence over fifteen hundred years too late to be the rule instituted by Christ, and which we charge with leading men into indifference, that apparently plausible saying which we hear so often that "one religion is as good as another" and which would make the God of eternal truth indifferent as to the profession by man of truth or falsehood; for evidently denominations at variance on all important matters connected with religion cannot be based on truth. It is this humiliating exhibition of Christianity which makes so many Infidels and causes the impious man to smile.

The Catholic Rule of Faith is not only consistent with faith but also reason. A man looks for certainty if he

CONTINUED ON FIRST PAGE.